Attorney Docket No. RSW920030177US1
Serial No. 10/705,555
Response to Office Action mailed February 20, 2007

II.   AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

A replacement sheet is attached with FIG. 3 to state in the top margin

"Replacement Sheet."   No other changes have been made to FIG. 3.

8

V. REMARKS

1. Drawings. A replacement sheet for FIG. 3 is attached.

2. Specification. The specification has been amended to remove the examiner's objections. Additional amendments have been made to capitalize the word JAVA.

3. The examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 25 and 26 under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has incorporated claims 3, 14, and 25 into their respective independent claims, but the term "substantially" has been deleted.

4. Claim rejections 35 U.S.C.§102(e). The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-13, 16-24 and 27-33 as being anticipated by Zimniewicz et al (US 6,744,450). Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 3, 14, and 25 into claims 1, 12, and 23 respectively. In addition, applicant has amended claims 1, 12, and 23 to include the limitation "recording a user's selected preference for a level of granularity in a log, and when the user participates in a subsequent installation, using the level in the log as a default level." Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 11, paragraph [42]. Applicant submits that the amended claims distinguish over Zimniewicz because Zimniewicz does not disclose the limitation of claim 3.

5. Claim rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The examiner rejected claims 3-4, 14-15 and 25-26 as being unpatentable over Zimniewicz et al. in view of Bourke-Dunphy et al. (US6,918,112). Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, and 23 to include the limitation "recording a user's selected preference for a level of granularity in a log, and when the user participates in a subsequent installation, using the level in the log as a default level." Support for the amendment is found in the specification on page 11, paragraph [42]. Applicant submits that the amended claims distinguish over Zimniewicz in view of Bourke-Dunphy because neither reference discloses a user preference log.

15

Attorney Docket No. RSW920030177US1
Serial No. 10/705,555
Response to Office Action mailed February 20, 2007

6. Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
Registration No. 37,720
Gordon & Rees LLP
Suite 2650
2100 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75201
214-231-4703
214-461-4053 (fax)
rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com

Attachment Replacement Sheet

16